

**Special Landmarks Board Meeting, February 15, 2012  
Discussion of Historic Preservation Issues in the Draft  
Chautauqua Collaborative Stewardship Framework**

**Landmarks Board members attending:** Mark Gerwing, Elizabeth Payton, John Spitzer

**Purpose:**

Provide feedback to relevant sections of the draft *Chautauqua Collaborative Stewardship Framework* prior to the City Council's discussion of the document at its February 28, 2012 study session.

The purpose of the February 28 study session is to provide the council with an opportunity to discuss the draft *Framework* and provide feedback on its approach in creating a process for decision-making for a variety of issues at Chautauqua.

**Background:**

The draft *Framework* is the result of a collaborative process to develop a stewardship process for the long-term management of Chautauqua. Anderson-Hallas architects were retained in September of 2011 to coordinate the project. Since then, they have conducted three public meetings and engaged in discussions with Chautauqua stakeholders. This input has informed the *Framework's* organization and content.

The following summarizes comments made by the Landmarks Board on at the February 15 study session:

**Project Need 1.1**

- \* Statement of need should be more explicit - explain and justify.
- \* Statement that at certain times of the year "Chautauqua's resources are underutilized" is conclusory. Provide information as to whether or not this is the historic pattern and explain why needs have changed, if they indeed have. Would increased use in winter affect the historic character of Chautauqua?
- \* Consider providing trends data rather than just "snapshot in time" data to illustrate how Chautauqua visitation has increased over time and to project future use?
- \* What are the occupancy trends at Chautauqua? At what point has capacity been met?

**Guiding Principles 1.3**

- \* Consider modifying the first bullet to identify preservation of historic character and fabric and NHL status; move CCA mission to a new bullet. \* Difference between bullet points and numbered points unclear – some reiterative.
- \* Include all relevant city boards as advisors in developing a vision

**Evaluation Criteria 4.2**

- \* Are all evaluation criteria equal? From Landmarks Board perspective, some are more important than others i.e. "minimize impacts to historic fabric & character" vs. "fully utilize facilities".
- \* Consider including criterion that addresses less tangible aspects of preservation of Chautauqua's character including seasonal use, types of activities, traffic, etc.
- \* Discussion as to whether criterion #9's mention of the Cultural Landscape Assessment is appropriate as this document has not been formally adopted by the City.
- \* Suggestion to add a criterion stating the importance that a proposal should benefit Boulder area citizens.
- \* Suggestion that something in criteria be added about minimizing loss of historic fabric, character, and avoiding the relocation of contributing buildings and structures.

### **Managing Change in Historic Districts**

- \* The board wondered how the National Park Service and Colorado Historic Society's letter "not recommending" new construction or relocation of contributing resources at Chautauqua informs decision-making in the framework.
- \* Document should include some discussion of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and whether they are applied differently in NHLs than National Register, or locally designated historic districts.
- \* Document needs to identify a way to integrate advice from NPS and State

### **Potential Building Locations**

- \* Section 5.3 needs to include analysis with justification as to why each identified location is appropriate
- \* Are all locations equally appropriate and for what type of new construction? Why or why not? i.e. why is south site identified as only appropriate for cottage construction while sites next to picnic shelter and tennis court given no such limitation.
- \* Document needs some language to the effect that alternative sites aren't recommendations for new construction, but that if new construction occurs, it should be limited to these sites.
- \* What is meant by "modestly scaled" new construction?
- \* Tennis court site needs to be better defined. Does it include the parking lot area? Are there areas within this site that might be more appropriate for new construction?

### **Potential Revisions to Chautauqua Design Guidelines**

- \* General agreement that design guidelines require revision to establish what Chautauqua is (defining the "nature of the place"), what it should become in the future.
- \* Such revisions should supplement the existing guidelines and not represent a major rewrite.
- \* Agreement that revisions are critical in guiding future change in the historic district. For instance, for additions and the possibility of free-standing construction, is contextual contemporary design appropriate or should the palette be limited to traditional design given the simple and relatively homogenous historic character of the place.
- \* Revised guidelines should be descriptive rather than too prescriptive to allow flexibility within and established framework.